

Remarks:

Claims 14-21 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,796,944 (“Hill”) in view of Davie, and under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,299,313 (“Petersen”) in view of U.S. Patent 5,815,501 (“Gaddis”). In response, claims 14-21 are canceled and new claims 46-62 are added. Applicant respectfully contends that new claims 46-62 are patentable over Hill, Davie, Petersen, and Gaddis, and the other art of record.

None of the references of record is believed to teach or suggest a network interface including a media access control that is programmable to perform a filtering operation on each packet of incoming frame data (to determine whether to accept the packet) and is also programmable to perform at least one additional operation in response to the incoming frame data (as recited in claim 46), or a method including a step of programming such a media access control to perform such an additional operation (as recited in claim 55). Support for the limitation of claims 46-50 and 55-59 can be found in the specification, for example, at page 9, lines 17-25 and page 7, line 32 through page 8, line 25.

Applicant notes that Petersen (at column 7, lines 4-28) teaches a multicast comparator module which performs bit by bit comparison of a received frame’s destination address with contents of a multicast address table. The contents of the multicast address table are said to be established by a host and stored in a RAM. However, neither Petersen nor any other reference of record is believed to teach or suggest a network interface including a media access control that is programmable as recited in claim 46.

None of the references of record is believed to teach or suggest a network interface including a media access control configured to perform a filtering operation on a destination address of each packet of incoming frame data before asserting all of the packet to a buffer manager and to assert all of the packet to the buffer manager only if the filtering operation results in a determination to accept the packet (as recited in claim 51), or a method including steps of: (a) operating a media access control to determine from a destination address of each packet of incoming frame data whether to accept the packet (before asserting all of the packet to a buffer manager) and (b) asserting all of the packet from the media access control to the

buffer manager only when step (a) results in a determination to accept the packet (as recited in claim 60). Support for the limitation of claims 51-53 and 60-62 can be found in the specification, for example, at page 6, line 20, through page 7, line 7.

Applicant respectfully requests consideration and allowance of claims 46-62.

Respectfully submitted,

GIRARD & EQUITZ LLP

Dated: 10/22/04 By: Alfred A. Equitz
Alfred A. Equitz
Reg. No. 30,922

Attorneys for Applicant(s)